

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 1-11 will have been canceled and claims 12-24 will have been submitted for consideration by the Examiner. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections of all the claims pending in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate and proper.

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the acknowledgment of Applicant's claims for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents in the Official Action. Applicant further notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statements filed in the present application on August 30, 2000 and November 22, 2000 by the return of the initialed and signed PTO-1449 Forms, and for consideration of the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statements.

Turning to the merits of the action, the Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by AKATSU et al. (U.S. Patent 6,466,862). The Examiner has rejected claims 5-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AKATSU et al. (U.S. Patent 6,466,862). The Examiner has rejected claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over AKATSU et al. (U.S. Patent 6,496,862) in view of HAMAMOTO et al. (U.S Patent 6,038,233).

As noted above, Applicant has canceled these rejected claims and has submitted new claims 12-24. Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection based on newly added claims 12-24 and will discuss said rejection with respect to the pending claims in the present application as will be set forth herein below. The newly added claims merely clarify the subject matter recited in the canceled claims, but do not narrow the scope of the claims.

In the above-noted rejection, the Examiner asserts that AKATSU discloses the same gateway apparatus as claimed in the present invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above.

Particularly, Applicant's claim 12 relates to a gateway apparatus at a transmitting side that receives data from the transmitting apparatus not having an IP address, configures data for Internet transmission, generates an Internet-frame based on the data and an IP address which is assigned to a receiving apparatus. The IP address assigned to the receiving apparatus is input by an input device. Claim 22 recites a related method.

However, the gateway apparatus disclosed in AKATSU relates to the gateway at a receiving side. AKATSU transforms a format of data in an external network into a format of data in an internal network. AKATSU contains no disclosure about how a transmitting apparatus not having an IP address such as e.g., a scanner inputs the IP address assigned to the receiving apparatus, when the transmitting apparatus not provided with the IP

address sends an Internet-frame to the receiving apparatus. The transmitting apparatus not having an IP address cannot input the IP address of the receiving apparatus by itself.

The Examiner also asserts that “using a computer to modify address table or configuration is well known in the art”. However, even if the general concept of using a computer to modify address table or configuration is well known in the art, it is not disclosed in the prior art that a transmitting apparatus not having an IP address, through an input device, inputs an IP address assigned to a receiving apparatus. An apparatus not having an IP address cannot input an IP address of the receiving apparatus and thus an input device as provided by the present invention becomes necessary. This feature, in the claimed combination, is not shown in the prior art applied by the Examiner.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the features recited in Applicant’s claims 12-15 and 22 are not disclosed in AKATSU recited by the Examiner and were not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Applicant’s claims also relate to a gateway apparatus at a receiving side that receives an Internet-frame including an IP address corresponding to a receiving apparatus not having an IP address and data from the transmitting apparatus, searches the memory for the receiving apparatus not having the IP address to which the data is to be transferred, based on the corresponding IP address included in the Internet-frame, and transfers the data to the receiving apparatus not having the IP address.

However, the gateway apparatus disclosed in AKATSU does not teach that “apparatus X is a non-IP apparatus from among apparatus on home network transmitting

data by an instruction from an IP apparatus on the home network”, and “taught that non-IP apparatus does not have a function of directly accessing to the Internet to communicate, but the IP apparatus has”, as recognized by the Examiner. In other words, AKATSU contains no disclosure about providing and utilizing an IP address when a receiving apparatus not having an IP address receives Internet-frame through the Internet. For example, Fig. 9 of AKATSU describes a protocol stack according ATM data transmission from an MPEG network to a TV adapter. Figs. 10 and 11 of AKATSU describe a protocol stack according to IP data transmission from an IP network to a PC. Fig. 12 of AKATSU describes a protocol stack for bitmap transfer between device (e.g., from the home gateway or the PC to the TV adapter) over an internal network. Thus, AKATSU contains no disclosure relating to Internet-frame transmission from an IP network to an apparatus not having an IP apparatus.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the features recited in Applicant’s claims 16-21 and 23-24 are not disclosed in AKATSU cited by the Examiner and were not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection and an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application in due course.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION


Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believes that he has now done so. Applicant has canceled the rejected

claims and has submitted new claims for consideration by the Examiner. With respect to the new claims, Applicant has pointed out the features thereof and has contrasted the features of the new claims with the disclosure of the references. Accordingly, Applicant has provided a clear evidentiary basis supporting the patentability of all claims in the present application and respectfully requests an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application in due course.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Kiyonori SEKIGUCHI



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

August 5, 2003
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191